DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 050 397

CG 006 401

AUTHOR Gordon, Jesse E.

TITLE The Universe of Need, Economic Conditions and the Mix of Services.

INSTITUTION Michigan Univ., Ann Arbor.
PUB DATE 28 Apr 71
NOTE 14p.; Paper presented at the National Conference on State and Local Manpower Policy Planning in Salt Lake City, Utah, April, 1971

EDRS PRICE EDRS Price MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS Employment Services, Job Placement, Labor Conditions, *Labor Demands, *Labor Market, *Manpower Development, *Manpower Utilization, *Organizational Change

ABSTRACT

This paper is concerned with the question of standardization of manpower services. It deals with the extent to which there is too much standardization in the mix of programs, with the cause of standardization, and with what can be done about it. The author proposes: (1) that the solution to over standardization of manpower services lies in eliminating the role of guidelines by altering the organizational structure to one which is not based on over arching centralized rule making; (2) that programs are over standardized intrinsically because they are run by agencies organized around a model which requires standardized tasks and work processes; and (3) that manpower agencies must change the basis of their organizational structure to one not requiring a uniform definition of tasks. To make the mix of services more responsive to the state of the local economy and to the range of the universe of need, a conversion of the manpower system to an alternative organizational type with greater local operational autonomy and control, as well as resources, is needed. (Author/TA)

ED050397

The Universe of Need, Economic Conditions and the Mix of Services*

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

Jesse E. Gordon
The University of Michigan

This paper is concerned with the question of standardization of manpower services. It deals with the extent to which there is too much standardization in the mix of programs, the cause of standardization, and what can be done about it.

There are many different ways of describing or analyzing manpower agencies, depending on what you want to do with the analysis. One way is to think of them as linkage mechanisms: that is, as organizations that exist in order to link or commect unemployed people with available jobs in the community. As linkage mechanisms, they also have transformational functions, in the sense that they could make, or attempt to make, some kinds of changes in either the jobs or the unemployed, in order to bring about a bond between the two. I say they could direct themselves toward transforming either of the parties to be linked. But as we all know in fact, manpower service agencies devote much more of their resources to processing and transforming the unemployed than they do to trying to make changes on the job market side. (I am not sure that this arrangement is inappropriate. It could be argued that the labor demand side of the transaction can be more effectively influenced by government-wide economic and monetary policy, and by equal opportunity legislation and enforcement, than it can by local manpower service agencies. And on the other hand, people-services obviously have to be performed at the local level, and there's not much that can be done at the executive or legislative level, beyond providing resources in time, money, and knowledge. Still, I personally wish it had been the local office of the State Employment Service in North Carolina which had brought the successful suit before the U.S. Supreme Court that resulted in a judgement against the Duke Power and Light Company for its use of the Wonderlic Personnel Test and the Bennett Mechanical Aptitude Test, instead of a non-governmental civil rights group.)

A manpower agency is a people-processor which takes its input--unemployed and underemployed people--and tries to change them in ways that will produce greater congruence with the characteristics of the labor demand in the community. It would probably be even better to describe them as government-owned business branches that give free services to customers seeking various types of jobs.

*Presented at National Conference on State and Local Manpower Policy Planning; Salt Lake City, April 28, 1971.

CG 006 401

In either case, the agency deals with two variable quantities: differences among customers who come to it on the input side (that is, human individual differences in the factors that disadvantage their relationships to the labor market), and on the output side, variations from place to place and time to time in the existing jobs.

If you are trying to transform different kinds of inputs (that is, different kinds of people who are unemployed) into different kinds of outputs (into welders, salesmen, machine operators, clerk-typists, etc.), you would expect that the transformation processes would also vary. As an analogy, if you are milling glass chinks into window panes, you would expect to use a very different set of machine processes, or transformation devices, than you would to convert wooden logs into paper. In manpower, you'd expect that different unemployed people would be handled differently, depending on what it is that puts them out of kilter with the labor market. And you would expect that in different communities, there would be differences in the kind of labor market you are trying to transform people for.

That makes sense, but does it happen? Garth Mangum reports that as far as preparation for jobs is concerned, a relatively small number of occupations account for the overwhelming bulk of MDTA training courses nationwide. And they are the same occupations in the aerospace northwest, electronic Los Angeles, mercantile New York, and heavy industry Pittsburgh and Detroit. Males are trained to fix cars or weld metal, females learn to make beds for hospitals or type and file. Only a small minority of people are trained for the great majority of other occupations, and the rest are put in limbo--that is, holding status (don't call us, we'll call you) or its equivalent in NYC or Mainstream. I don't know whether that is a lot or a little variability; I am convinced that there's more uniformity in manpower training programs than there is in job markets, and more than you would expect by chance alone, if you randomly picked eligible DOT occupations out of a fishbowl.

I know somewhat more about variability--or its opposite, standardization--in dealing with the factors that disadvantage peoples' relations to the existing jobs. I've been through manpower agency programs as a client and as part of the enrollee or applicant group in every section of the country. I've spent months of my life over the past few years being oriented and assessed on the east coast, in the deep south, midwest, and west coast. There are remarkable similarities and some differences in my experience in all of these programs.

The similarities seem to me to be essential, the differences marginal. For example, every orientation program included grooming, why people should work, why it is bad to get into trouble with the police, what employers want, how to fill out a job application, how to take a test, and how to behave in a job interview. Clearly, it was assumed that these are program elements that will change a mismatch with the labor market into a closer match, for all the people in the groups with which I was oriented and assessed.

The differences I experienced were more marginal or peripheral: in an agency which routinely has sensitivity training for its staff, we had human relations training and sensitivity games; in a YWCA which ran a WIN program, the ladies got an hour of swim and trim every day. In a third program, the group leader (who had been a high school math teacher) gave arithmetic lessons in order to improve our performance on employment tests. In another, a young lady-- a former manicurist-- put a heavy emphasis on finger and nail care as part of grooming, while another group leader told an all black (except for me) group that being afraid of police isn't a racial thing at all-- that whites feel just as nervous when being eyed by a policeman as blacks. And in yet another program-- one in which the manager, most of the staff, and all the enrollees were black, there was considerable discussion of black power, while in a sister program across town, which had a Chicano manager, a mostly Chicano staff, and an all Chicano applicant group, the discussion was of La Raza. Incidentally, a few months earlier, when that same sister program was run by an Anglo manager and largely Anglo staff, there was no such discussion, although the clientele was just as uniformly Chicano.

To some very small extent, the <u>differences</u> among these programs arose from the nature of the clientele. More often, it was the traditions of the program's sponsorship, the nature of the staff's competencies, and the individual interests of the staff members that accounted for the differences. In any case, the differences were <u>local</u> in their origin, while the similarities were <u>national</u>. The similarities came out of guidelines, which in turn were products of the national definition of disadvantagement, the official theory of why people are unemployed.

Please note that there is silliness and nonsense on both sides, as well as wisdom and appropriateness. Some of the local variations were stupid,

but some were right on. And some aspects of the national similarities were an equally mixed bag of silliness and appropriateness. While many enrollees are poorly dressed, I never encountered a situation in which all of the group that got lessons in grooming needed or wanted them. While some needed help in being interviewed, I was never in a group in which everyone did. How many of us would be turned on by a 6th grade history lesson, by a discussion of the importance of proper nutrition, or of caulking the seams of a laminated sailboat of the Star class? It is only one's poverty and lack of alternatives (and the MDTA stipends) that keeps one sitting through material he doesn't need to learn, either because he already knows it or doesn't ever need to know it.

One can identify about eight topics which are standardly covered in orientation and assessment programs, and in counseling carried on in conjunction with work experience training. I have made some wild and generous estimates of the proportions of enrollees for whom each such topic is relevant. For example, I have estimated that up to one half of the trainees could use some lessons in grooming, about one quarter need "motivation", perhaps half need help in dealing with job applications, and so forth. Based on my experience, I have also estimated the proportion of time which enrollees spend in these various topics. Putting all these estimates together, it figures out to the following: out of a total of 60 hours (the usual length of orientation and assessment) spent by a group of 20 enrollees (a typically-sized group), you have a total of 1200 man hours spent in discussion of those eight topics. Based on estimates of the proportions of the group "needing" each of the subjects, it comes out to a total of 725 man hours spent on topics irrelevant to the people receiving the training. In a group of 20, that means that on the average, each person is wasting 36 1/4 hours of the 60, or 60.4% of the time he spends in orientation. The probability that a trainee finds the total array of topics useful is .0004, or 4 out of ten thousand. The probability that even one of the trainees finds the whole presentation relevant to his needs is .009, or 9 out of one thousand. What you end up with is the conclusion that the chances of a prescribed set of topics answering a particular enrollee's needs is infinitesimally small. Put another way, for the average enrollee, we are asking him to sit through three more hours of irrelevancy for each two hours of helpfulness.

I would say that that is too much standardization, when it is measured against applicant needs. And that is with the assumption that the portion which is relevant is effectively presented and actually makes a difference in the state

of the enrollee's relationship to the job market.

Why do we have so much standardization? Let me say flatly that I do not believe that it is because of venality, stupidity, or racism on the part of the guideline-writing leadership or DOL program reviewers. Or rather, I don't think that you would change anything significantly by changing the persons who are in leadership positions, even if you exchanged them for certified saints. The cause of the problem does not lie in the contents of the guidelines. Given any other set of topics which are not universally applicable to all enrollees, the probabilities would still be low that the entire program would touch any particular individual's needs, and the average enrollee would still spend a great deal of his time being turned off-- or "unmotivated." And that is still assuming that what is relevant is 100% effective. At any lower levels of effectiveness, the wasted enrollee man hours grows proportionately. At 50% effectiveness, which I believe to be a gross overestimate for counseling and guidance, the figures reduce to spending only 1 out of 5 hours of effective relevance for the average enrollee, or about 1 hour and 12 minutes out of a full day of work adjustment training. So you won't improve the situation much by changing the contents of the guidelines to different ones that might be constructed by different people at the top.

DOL is aware of this problem, and there are several in the Department who have been sponsoring research which seeks to divide the definition of the target population of manpower programs into subgroups, such as various types of disadvantagement, so that the transformation operations of the programs can be differentially prescribed. Presumably, the outcome of such research would be a set of suggestions for differential handling of different enrollee or applicant types. And in time, of course, those suggestions would be built into guidelines-- and let us all admit that the word "guideline" is a euphemism for a rule which can be violated now and then, but at your own risk.

Such an approach would increase the probability that a particular mix of services would be right for a particular enrollee. But if you had a great many categories or types, there wouldn't be enough applicants in any one type to run its associated program, and if you had too few categories, there would still be individual differences among the enrollees in any type group, so that some part of the program each type gets would be inappropriate or irrelevant to some enrollees in it. And then there would still be the question of the effectiveness of each of the program elements in actually changing the enrollees' disadvantages.

It thus seems that neither solution, getting better guidelines or subdividing the the target population, can do more than trim some ragged edges;

neither would produce enough gains to make it worthwhile.

But both of these solutions are consistent with the structure of manpower and other federal programs. An examination of that consistency can lead us to an alternative and potentially more productive solution-- a solution more enduring than any possible catalogue of program services that any of us might construct to fill in gaps in the existing laundry list of programs and services, or to be more appropriate to the various parts of the universe of need. The rest of this paper deals with such an examination, which represents my adaptation to the manpower field of the brilliant organizational research of Prof. Eugene Litwak and his colleagues.

Manpower magazine has just published a precis of a speech in which I discussed some of the causes and consequences of labelling people as "disadvantaged." I tried to show, in that speech, that labelling a client group obscures individual differences, and so leads to over-standardization of programs. I also criticized such labelling as divisive, inappropriate, contrary to American traditions of political thought, and self-defeating in that it puts a built-in limit on manpower program effectiveness.

But there was one part of that speech which I would like to amplify and extend here. It is that the labelling process, and the program standardization to which it leads, is an inherent necessity of the structure and organization of the manpower system. Over-standardization and its related labelling process cannot be changed in any essential way without revising that organization quite thoroughly. My objective now is to suggest to you, therefore, that the solution to over-standardization of manpower services lies not in greater wisdom, sensitivity, or even technical knowledge among guideline writers and enforcers, nor does it lie in writing more explicit guidelines for different client groups. It lies in eliminating the role of guidelines by altering the organizational structure to one which is not based on over-arching centralized rule-making. In what follows, I will try to describe the relationship between standardization of services and organizational structure, in order to arrive at some recommendations of alternative structures that would reduce over-standardization. Certainly it would be fruitless to complain in general terms about "the system" without posing an alternative, so I will make some fairly specific suggestions along that line.

Organizations structure themselves as they do because of the kinds of tasks that they perform. When the job to be done is a recurrent, regular, and

predictable one, it can most efficiently be done by a specifically targeted operation specialized for performing that task. The epitome of such an operation is an automatic machine-- say a stamping press which molds front hoods for Ford Torinos. Approaching such machine-like efficiency and specificity of function is an organization in which it is people rather than machines who are programmed to perform specialized functions. They do their work according to rules that keep them on target, properly sequenced, and coordinated with the functions of others whose work is related to theirs. Thus the janitor follows a rule to open the office at a special and particular time, so that staff members can all begin the work day at approximately the same time every day, and they don't need to have a meeting at the end of each day's work to discuss and decide what time the janitor should unlock the place the next day. Coordination, rule-making, and rule enforcement are management functions, expecially if the rules are based on expensive technical expertize which is not needed by or represented in the operating staff. The riveter doesn't need to know how to design a ship in order to do his job, if he can follow plans constructed by others who do know how, even if they don't happen to know how to handle a rivet-gun themselves. In short, specialized knowledge applied to routine and repetitive functions requires an authority heirarchy for planning, coordination, and enforcement. Thus standardization of the work to be done leads to an heirarchical organization in which actual operations are separated from policy-making and rules construction.

When coordination is arranged and supervised by higher-ups, work proceeds according to formal rules, and the relationships among workers can be relatively impersonal. They don't have to relate to each other emotionally and socially in order to get the job done. They can communicate by checklists, given the restricted range of job-relevant communications needed for performing predictable, standardized work. An assembly line worker doesn't have to talk much to another one elsewhere on the line in order to do his job, although it is nice to have friends at work, it makes life pleasanter, and so increases company loyalty. If there is any message to be passed about the work being done, the message can usually consist of a check in a box on a buckslip sent along with the part being assembled, as even the various types of special messages and instructions tend to be repetitive and recurrent.

To put it all together, uniform tasks lead to the kind of organization

which is known technically as a rationalistic (or bureaucratic) organization. It is characterized by a vertical authority structure, specialized job roles, policy made by people other than those in closest touch with the clients, and relatively impersonal relations among staff members. We can recognize this structure as essentially the model followed by the manpower system.

This kind of structure was a logical development of the task of the old Employment Service as a labor exchange mechanism-- a fairly standardized task. If you look at a range of agencies, you can see where the old ES fell on the continuum. At one extreme would be an agency like social security. The task of social security offices is to establish eligibility according to very formal rules. It is therefore highly standardized. A recent project done for the Department of HEW by Eugene Litwak and Jack Rothman of the University of Michigan and Manpower Science Services demonstrated that social security offices are indeed at the extreme end of the continuum in having a formal, rationalistic, or bureaucratic structure.

At the other end of the continuum would be a vocational rehabilitation agency, such as a sheltered workshop which does treatment of physically and mentally handicapped people. As a people-transforming agency which must deal with a wide range of individual differences in client needs and job demands, our evidence from the Litwak-Rothman project shows that it is quite different from the bureaucratic model in its organization. If each client is different, and has different needs, decisions on what and how treatment is to be done must be made by those closest to the client-- the operational staff of the agency-- rather than by a policy and rule-making authority structure which is removed from direct knowledge of the individual client. Therefore the judgments of the practitioners in the agency have primacy over those of higher status people. This means less separation of policy from operations, less of a top-down flow of orders and directions from an authority heirarchy. Indeed, there is relatively little authority vested in the heirarchy. And because different decisions have to be made about each client, based on the judgments of staff rather than on formal rules, staff have to talk to each other about the client. Each one contributes information and judgment from his internal rules developed through his training and experience. So communications are more informal, and more frequent among colleagues. Checklists or case record forms aren't sufficient for diagnosis and treatment, although they may serve as records. As a consequence of that insufficiency, people in the organization have to relate well enough

to each other that they can and will communicate often and fully about clients. Thus much of the decision-making and planning in the vocational rehabilitation agency was done in informal conversations among peers, and in frequent staff meetings chaired, but not directed, by the agency manager. The reason you cannot imagine that kind of thing happening in a social security office is that the task of the social security office is so standardized that the staff has few options- few things that it can and must make decisions about-- and explicit rules to cover those things that it must decide.

The ES used to be close to the social security office in its task of matching people to jobs. In a sense, the job requirements stated by those who placed job orders with the ES, when translated into a DOT code, are not unlike eligibility standards such as those with which social security deals (although job requirements can be more flexible because they are not based on legislation). Therefore, the ES had a bureaucratic structure like social security, and UI, having a task even more centrally concerned with eligibility, still does have such a structure.

But as we all know, the ES has been going through a remarkable series of changes as part of the manpower movement. Its charge now is to transform people, not just match them to job orders. In other words, the function of the ES has changed to being less like those of social security; it has moved much closer to the functions of the vocational rehabilitation agency. And that means that the old structure is no longer appropriate. Accordingly, ES functions were split away from UI, into a theoretically separate organization. I will deal later with the question of whether that separate organization has in fact changed its structure to one more consistent with the new functions. But first, I would like to note another development.

When the ES was called upon to become a transforming agency, the rationalistic structure appropriate to standardized tasks of job-order matching already existed. That existing structure therefore acted as if its new target population and task was uniform or standardized. It thought of its new task in terms of applying old functions to a new target population, and thought of the new programs as being like job orders, with different kinds of entrance requirements. It carried over the same specialized role functions (placement interviewers, intake interviewers, job developers, counselors) and even added one or two new specialties such as job coaches and work training specialists. It carried over the same work flow, client processing procedures, and authority

structure.

In other words, the prior existence of a rationalistic organization inclined the ES to define its new task in a standardized way: to define disadvantagement as a single target population having essential characteristics in common, with varying eligibilities for entrance into standardized programs. And while everyone recognizes the bewildering array of human individual differences, even or especially among the disadvantaged, the existing structure led the system to act as if its task was a uniform one. There is individualization in the sense that employability development plans differ somewhat from client to client <u>on paper</u>. But eligibility standards according to formal rules, and slot-filling are the major criteria for putting people into programs, and there is little relationship between the recognized individual differences in the employability plans and what gets done by the programs into which applicants are slotted. Within the various programs, contents are selected as if the ways in which people differ are by and large marginal or irrelevant, while their similarities as far as employability development is concerned are essential.

In my earlier remarks I said that <u>program similarities</u> among manpower agencies are essential and nationally-mandated, while differences are marginal and local in origin. That is directly parallel to this observation that the similarities among unemployed <u>people</u> are seen as essential-- especially for the so-called "hard core"-- and differences are marginal or irrelevant, and seldom acted upon in practice. Thus the standardization of programs matches the definition of the work to be done as uniform- a definition which stems from an agency structure which requires and works best with task uniformity.

My conclusion is based on these observations; it is that programs are over-standardized intrinsically because they are run by agencies organized around a model which requires standardized tasks and work processes. And that if a manpower agency is to be more responsive to the non-uniform characteristics of its customers and the job market, on the level of action as well as on the level of emotional and verbal commitment, it must change the basis of its organizational structure to one which does not require a uniform definition of tasks.

The mismatch between the ES' rationalistic structure and its declared intention of individualized services to the disadvantaged has produced strains and pressures: charges of irrelevance, rigidity, ineffectiveness, demands for greater participation by clients-- and staff-- in local agency decision-making, demands for revision of hiring and staff selection practices, complaints by

staff about too narrow role definitions and too many prohibitive rules, etc. These are complaints about a rationalistic organization trying to perform non-uniform tasks; they are requests that the organization structure itself in a way that is more consistent with and facilitative of the job of dealing with variability among clients and job markets.

Manpower programs have been responding to these pressures, and they have in fact been moving precisely in the direction of a structure more appropriate to non-uniform tasks. The particular structure appropriate to such tasks is one which has been called by various names: human relations, professional, collegial. I don't particularly care for any of these labels, but collegial comes closest to being right, in the sense of reflecting that the organization is based on the interaction of colleagues ("collegial" shouldn't be confused with "collegiate", which has nothing to do with the case under discussion here). In a collegial organization, the power/authority structure is inverted, or at least flattened, with the practitioners and workers in the agency making the operating decisions. The top man is more in the position of a chairman-coordinator who provides services and resources to his constituents, the practitioners who carry out the work of the agency. He serves only as long as they continue to find his services useful and effective, as an attorney serves his clients only as long as they choose to continue him because he is doing for them what they want and need. It might be called government by the consent of the governed, as Jefferson put it. In such an organization, then, decision-making is decentralized. The operational staff has to participate in the agency's decision-making because the chairman-coordinator lacks the authority and the knowledge of individual client needs to make his own decisions about how the available resources will be allocated.

In such a decentralized organization there are few rules, so that the work performed can be maximally responsive to varying needs of the clients and of the job market. Without rules and rule-enforcing authority, control and enforcement of standards is done through the social pressure of colleagues. They must therefore be in frequent contact and communication with each other. A form is developed in which implicit criticisms of each other are sanitized, so that the agency is not rent by too much conflict. That form consists of making alternative suggestions or recommendations for action on which the staff votes, and everyone gets used to having some of his motions passed, some not, and most worked out in compromise.

In a collegial organization like this, staff develop relatively personal social relationships, out of which some sense of group cohesiveness and identification with the organization is formed. Clearly such an organization would be inappropriate for an assembly line operation, or for a social security office, but you can imagine it in a vocational rehabilitation agency, or a community mental hygiene clinic.

This kind of organization has its problems. It can become very "in-groupy" and self-protective. It can be very resistant to change, innovation, and deviance from the agency ideology by individual staff members. But there are ways of dealing with these problems without destroying the appropriateness of the structure for dealing with non-uniform tasks.

Does such an organization exist anywhere? It exists in some of its features in friendship groups, in fraternal and social clubs, in civic organizations and Chambers of Commerce. In the world of work it exists in law firms, advertizing agencies, group medical practice, research and development firms, and in companies that make tailor-made products (e.g., specialty engineering, architecture, industrial refrigeration and heating). In larger organizations having non-uniform tasks, this kind of organization exists in those divisions responsible for the non-uniform tasks while the bureaucratic organization exists in the divisions dealing with recurrent and predictable tasks. Thus physicians in a large hospital are organized as colleagues, while the housekeeping and maintenance staffs operate in a rationalistic mode.

Manpower agencies have been making progress toward the collegial model. The first step in this direction was the separation of ES from UI. The second step included the introduction of the team concept and employability development plans. In some places the team chairman is elected by the team members without regard to job status, but with his regard to /his ability to keep people solving problems cooperatively.

A third step seems to be in the works in one form or another: decentralization of the entire system either through revenue-sharing or through the Comprehensive Manpower Act-- although I am not sure that either one of these embodies the best ways to achieve the goals of decentralization, non-uniform manpower services.

The team concept has not yet taken hold, and there is a great deal of resistence to it. That resistence is in part based on the difficulty of shifting from one kind of organization to another without recognizing all the implications

for specialization of function, staff selection, participation in decision-making, separation of policy from operations, revised authority and status structure, which such a shift entails. There are a lot of problems with the team concept, not the least of which is the inherent contradiction of an order or guideline coming from a centralized heirarchy to develop a decentralized and collegial team operation. That sounds very much like a remark I once heard a liberal German professor make to one of his student-teachers: "You will be democratic in your teaching or I will throw you out of the department!"

But more problematic is the conflict between the team concept and the organizational structure of the local agency surrounding it, and in which it is implanted, almost like a foriegn body. How can a collegial team, operating with few formal rules so that it can be adaptive to the individual needs of its caseload, get along in an heirarchical office with a manager who is in turn held responsible by those still higher up for rule enforcement and guideline adherence? How can a team design programs for individual applicants when it has no control over the agency's resources, cannot establish programs, and cannot get much from the local manager because he has few options open to him?

I don't think we'll solve the problems of getting the team concept working until there is a more thorough revision of the rationalistic structure of the system as a whole. Instead, we are more likely to see an erosion of the team into a mini-bureaucracy within a bureaucracy, with formal separation of functions, its own heirarchy, rules, and rigid work flow patterns. The result will be over-standardized services to enrollees, leaving little more than lip-service to individualization.

The team will not endure as a collegial form until ways are found to do two things: make all of local management a participatory affair so that the team can command resources and freedom to operate; and relate the local agency to the larger system in a way that maintains both the effectiveness and the autonomy of the local agency.

To solve these problems we would do well to search for existing models or examples of effective collegial organizations. I am not sure where examples might be found of organizations as large as the manpower system, but two possibilities suggest themselves. I am not sure that either of them has worked out all the bugs, but they may have worked out enough of them so that they can operate effectively in dealing with non-uniform tasks.

One example might be the VA or USPHS hospital system, but I don't know

enough about that system to know how it deals with problems of local autonomy of physicians and public accountability through the federal heirarchy. Another possible model to be studied is the relationship between an auto manufacturer, representing a centralized and bureaucratic provider of resources, and its dealership system of quasi-independent local agencies. Local dealers do manage to reflect and maintain a fair amount of variability from one dealer to another, in response to local situations and within certain broad limits. They give different kinds of "deals" on cars, take different kinds of risks with different customers, provide different levels and kinds of service, etc. Again, I plead ignorance of the details, and can only recommend that the manufacturer-dealer system be examined with an eye toward trying to discover ways in which it has solved problems of local autonomy within a larger system, without losing accountability or violating minimal standards. Then we can think about how the manpower system might adapt some of those solutions.

In sum, my major conclusion and recommendation is this: if the mix of services is to be made more responsive to the state of the local economy and to the range of the universe of need, the solution is to be found not by inventing new national programs and guidelines. It is to be found in a conversion of the manpower system to an alternative organizational type with greater local operational autonomy and control, to say nothing of resources. A more enduring and self-regenerating alternative to the never-ending flow of guidelines and program elements from a centralized heirarchy is a collegial model of organization for agencies engaged in people-transforming operations.